DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 142 JC 820 396

AUTHOR Walker, James W.
TITLE A Successful Revision of a Faculty Evaluation Procedure.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 11p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; *Peer Evaluation; Policy Formation; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Improvement; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *El Camino College CA

ABSTRACT

In 1979, El Camino College revised its faculty evaluation procedure, impelled by concerns over the severe consequences and resultant rarity of unsatisfactory ratings, the reluctance of faculty to evaluate their peers, and the high requirements of faculty time. The new procedure includes the following components: (1) options allowing tenured faculty to request that the division dean act as sole evaluator, or that a panel, consisting of the dean and two faculty members, be chosen as evaluators; (2) a self-evaluation report including objectives for instructional improvement, professional growth activities, and the extent to which previous objectives for instructional improvement have been met; (3) student evaluations of instructor performance; (4) an evaluation conference at which the results of the student evaluations and self-evaluation are reviewed; (5) provisions for peer assistance for faculty who receive unsatisfactory ratings or who are identified as being in need of continued evaluation, and (6) the designation of an evaluation team to review the results of continued evaluations and make recommendations. At the conclusion of the 1981 fall semester, all instructors had been evaluated once using the new procedure, which has been well received by faculty and management and resulted in a greater tendency to identify those instructors that need assistance. The complete faculty evaluation procedure is appended. (KL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220142

A SUCCESSFUL REVISION OF A FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Dr. James W. Walker, Dean
Division of Natural Sciences
El Camino Community College District
Torrance, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James W. Walker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

■ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 820 396

A SUCCESSFUL REVISION OF A FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURE

El Camino College is a large, single-campus community college in southwestern Los Angeles County. The College has an enrollment of 32,000 students and employs a staff of 320 full-time instructors.

Since 1972 all full-time instructors have been formally evaluated every two years. In 1979 the evaluation procedure was drastically revised. The major reasons for this revision were:

1. The consequences of receiving a rating other than "satisfactory" were too severe and the result was a reluctance on the part of evaluation panels to recommend anything other than a "satisfactory" rating.
2. There was a reluctance on the part of faculty to evaluate their peers. The evaluation report, written by a faculty panel member, usually turned out to be minutes of the evaluation conference and contained few, if any, suggestions for improving instruction.
3. Too much faculty time was being used. Under the old policy, each evaluatee was evaluated by a panel consisting of two faculty members and the dean. One of the faculty members was responsible for distributing a student questionnaire to all the evaluatee's students. The other faculty member wrote the evaluation report based on an evaluation conference.

It is important to keep in mind that the primary objective of faculty evaluation is the improvement of instruction. There is no merit pay at El Camino, and faculty promotions are based on length of service. If an instructor is having problems, it is necessary to be able to work with the individual in a positive way and avoid all threats of job termination or other dire consequences.

During the first 15 semesters of faculty evaluation, eight instructors were given a rating that was not satisfactory. During the four semesters that the new evaluation procedure has been used, seven instructors have been given a

rating that was not satisfactory. The implication is that there is now a greater tendency to identify those instructors that need help. Of those that were placed on "continued evaluation" five were eventually given a "satisfactory" rating, two chose to retire, primarily because of the evaluation.

The revised evaluation procedure allows the tenured faculty member to exercise the option of requesting the division dean, with his concurrence, to act as the sole evaluator. The panel, if chosen, consists of the dean and a regular faculty member appointed by the dean from a list of three candidates submitted by the evaluatee from the evaluatee's own division. Almost all choose the dean as the sole evaluator.

Each evaluatee prepares a written self-evaluation report that must include, but may not be limited to:

1. Objectives for the improvement of instruction based on the job description and the results of a student survey, a self-examination of teaching (or appropriate) methods, student achievement, and whatever other factors the panel; or if there is no panel, the dean deems relevant.
2. Professional growth activities.
3. To what extend the objectives for the improvement of instruction stated in the evaluatee's last report have been met.

A student survey is administered to all the evaluatee's students during the ninth week of the semester. The survey is administered by the dean or a designee who may not be the evaluatee or an instructor. The survey itself is one which has been developed and approved by the dean and the faculty of the division and/or department in which the instructor teaches.

An evaluation conference is scheduled at which time the evaluatee's written self-evaluation and student survey are reviewed. Following the conference, the self-evaluation, any additional reports deemed necessary by the evaluator(s),

and a statement recommending that the faculty member's performance is judged to be satisfactory or in need of continued evaluation is submitted to the faculty member. The evaluatee may submit a written statement of dissenting opinion. All reports are submitted to the Vice-president, Instruction with copies to the President.

If a faculty member is identified as in need of continued evaluation, a panel is formed which includes the dean and two regular faculty members. The panel may work with the faculty member for not more than two semesters. The rating is then changed to either satisfactory or requires further evaluation.

If a faculty member is identified as in need of further evaluation, an evaluation team is selected. This may be done only after the instructor has been placed on continued evaluation. The team includes the Vice President, dean of the division, and three regular faculty members. If at least four members of the evaluation team conclude that the faculty member has not made sufficient improvement, suspension or dismissal is recommended.

Any faculty member who is placed on continued or further evaluation is not eligible for sabbatical leave, summer teaching, or overload. The only exception is if it is determined that a sabbatical leave would assist the faculty member in obtaining a satisfactory evaluation.

At the conclusion of the 1981 fall semester all instructors had been evaluated once using the new procedure. The procedure has been well received by both faculty and the managment responsible for implementing the policy.

NOTE: Copies of the complete faculty evaluation procedure (see Appendix A) are available by writing:

Dr. James W. Walker
Dean, Division of Natural Sciences
El Camino College
Torrance, CA 90506

APPENDIX A

Procedures for Faculty Evaluation

The purpose of this Article is to improve instruction, counseling and other educational services assigned by the District through the periodic evaluation of contract and regular Faculty Members.

Section 1. Evaluation of Contract Faculty Members.

(a) Each contract Faculty Member will be evaluated each semester by an evaluation panel. The panel will be chaired by the Dean of the Faculty Member's division. The panel shall consist of the Dean and a regular Faculty Member appointed by the Dean and a regular Faculty Member appointed by the Faculty Members on the evaluatee's screening committee. All panel members will serve for at least one (1) year.

(b) Self Evaluation. Each Faculty Member shall prepare a written self-evaluation report and present copies to all panel members two (2) weeks before the

evaluation meeting. The report shall include, but may not be limited to:

1. Objectives for the improvement of instruction based on the job description and the results of the student survey, a self-examination teaching (or appropriate) methods, student achievement, and whatever other factors the panel deems relevant.

2. Professional growth activities.

3. To what extent the objectives for the improvement of instruction stated in the evaluatee's last report have been met.

(c) Student Evaluation. A student survey shall be administered by the Dean or designee each semester to all students. The Dean's designee shall not be the evaluatee or an Instructor, except in unusual circumstances. This survey shall be one which has been developed and approved by the Dean and the faculty of the division and/or department in which the instructor teaches. Additional questions may be added to the questionnaire if the panel and evaluatee agree. The questionnaire will be administered to all classes during the ninth week of the semester.

(d) Peer Evaluation. All members of the evaluation panel are required to make at least one classroom observation each semester.

(e) Evaluation Conference. An evaluation conference will be scheduled by the Dean each semester, at which all members of the evaluation panel must be present. The conference will deal with the items listed in the evaluatee's self-evaluation report. The evaluation process is not required during the fourth semester if the contract instructor has been evaluated as satisfactory during the three prior semesters.

(f) Evaluation Report. Following the conference, the self-evaluation, any additional reports deemed necessary by the panel, and a statement recommending whether continued employment is or is not recommended will be submitted to the Vice President, with copies to the Faculty Member, the Dean and the President. In addition, the evaluatee or member of the panel may submit a written signed statement of a dissenting opinion, which statement shall include reasons for the disagreement.

Section 2. Evaluation of Regular Faculty Members.

(a) Every two (2) years each regular Faculty Member will be evaluated by an evaluation panel, or the Faculty Member may exercise the option of requesting the Dean, with his concurrence to act as the sole evaluator. The panel, if chosen, shall consist of the Dean and a regular Faculty Member appointed by the Dean and a regular Faculty Member appointed by the Dean from a list of three (3) candicates submitted by the evaluatee from his own division.

(b) Self-Evaluation. Each Faculty Member shall prepare a written self-evaluation report and present copies to all panel members two (2) weeks before the evaluation meeting. The report shall include, but may not be limited to:

1. Objectives for the improvement of instruction based on the job description and the results of the student survey, a self-examination of teaching (or appropriate) methods, student achievement, and whatever other factors the panel, or if there is no panel, the Dean, deems relevant.

2. Professional growth activities.

3. To what extent the objectives for the improvement of instruction stated in the evaluatee's last report have been met.

(c) Student Evaluation. A student survey shall be administered and shall be the same as set forth in Section 1(c) of this Article.

(d) Evaluation Conference. The evaluation conference will be scheduled by the Dean. If a panel is used, all members must be present. The conference will deal with the items listed in the evaluatee's self-evaluation report.

(e) Evaluation Report. Following the conference, the self-evaluation, any additional reports deemed necessary by the evaluator(s), and a statement recommending that the Faculty Member's performance is judged to be satisfactory, or in need of continued evaluation, shall be submitted to the Faculty Member. The evaluatee or a panel member may submit a written, signed statement of the dissenting opinion, which statement shall include reasons for the disagreement. All reports will be submitted to the Vice President with copies to the President.

(f) If the Faculty Member is identified as in need of continued evaluation by the Dean, a panel will be formed which will include the Dean and two (2) regular Faculty Members, one (1) appointed by the Dean from within the division and one(1) selected by the division representative of the Federation. If this decision was made by a panel, its members will be retained for continued evaluation. The Faculty Member to be evaluated may disqualify one (1) of the two (2) panel members initially chosen and the person disqualified shall be replaced using the same process with no further right to disqualification. The Faculty Member shall not be informed of which selection method resulted in the selection of either panel member, nor shall panel members be informed of their selection until the Faculty Member has had an opportunity to exercise the disqualification option. This panel will work with the Faculty Member for not more than two (2) semesters after the one in which the rating was assigned. The rating will then be changed to satisfactory or requires further evaluation. The panel may conduct appropriate observations of the Faculty Member, administer student surveys as appropriate, hold conferences with the Faculty Member, and require the Faculty Member to present other materials such as student records and tests.

(g) If the Faculty Member is identified as in need of further evaluation, an evaluation team will be selected. The team shall include the Vice President, who shall chair the team, the Dean of the division and three (3) regular Faculty Members. The three (3) Faculty Members shall be appointed by the President of the Federation from a list of seven (7) regular Faculty Members (at least five (5) of whom are from the evaluatee's division) submitted by the Vice President. The Faculty Member has the right to disqualify one (1) of the those Faculty Members initially appointed to the team. The team members will not be informed of their appointment until the Faculty Member has had an opportunity to exercise the disqualification option. The team members may observe the Faculty Member as many times as is necessary, conduct any type of student and/or peer survey that may be helpful in analyzing the Faculty Member's performance, and may hold conferences as the panel deems necessary with the Faculty Member for the purpose of discussing their findings and recommendations.

(h) The evaluation team shall prepare a written report with recommendations, which report will be signed by the Faculty Member and by each member of the evaluation team. The Vice President may assign the drafting of the

report to a member of the team. If the evaluation team concludes that the Faculty Member has made the necessary improvement, the evaluation will be determined to be satisfactory. If at least four (4) members of the evaluation team conclude that the Faculty Member has not made sufficient improvement, suspension or dismissal will be recommended. The report will be submitted to the President with copies to the Faculty Member, the Vice President and the Dean. Such report will be submitted not later than fifteen (15) days following the second semester of further evaluation. If the Faculty Member or any member of the team does not concur with the report, such individual may submit a written, signed statement of the dissenting opinion, which statement shall include the reasons for the disagreement.

(i) If a regular Faculty Member is deemed in need of continued evaluation or further evaluations, the Faculty Member will not be eligible for sabbatical leave unless and until the Faculty Member has been determined to be satisfactory, except that the District may approve a sabbatical leave for such Faculty Member if it determines that such sabbatical leave would assist the Faculty Member in obtaining a satisfactory evaluation. In addition, the Faculty Member will not be eligible for summer school, overload, or any assignment beyond a regular load.

Section 3. General Conditions.

(a) All records and reports of the evaluation procedure will be retained by the District in the Faculty Member's personnel file and such reports and records may be utilized in any proceeding subject to the provisions of the Education Code.

(b) A Faculty Member may not be required to serve on more than one evaluation panel or one evaluation team each semester.

(c) A Faculty Member who is undergoing continued evaluation shall not be eligible to serve on any evaluation panel or evaluation team until the Faculty Member's evaluation is concluded as satisfactory. Any Faculty Member who at any time undergoes further evaluation will not be eligible to serve on any evaluation panel or evaluation team until the Faculty Member has received three (3) successive satisfactory evaluations.

Section 4. Evaluation Procedures Committee.

An Evaluation Procedures Committee of six (6) persons, three (3) appointed by the District and three (3) appointed by the Federation, will be constituted to evaluate the effectiveness of these procedures and to make recommendations to the District and the Federation for any change.

Section 5. Student Questionnaires.

A copy of any student survey developed by a division and/or department to be used in the evaluation of Faculty Members shall be sent to the Evaluation Procedures Committee. It will be the responsibility of this Committee to periodically review these questionnaires and suggest changes, if appropriate.

Section 6. Part-Time Faculty Members.

Full-time Faculty Members may be required to evaluate part-time Faculty Members, provided that no more than one (1) part-time Faculty Member's evaluation may be required of any full-time Faculty Member during any semester.

Section 7. General.

Where appropriate an Associate Dean or Director, when assigned by the Vice President, Instruction or Vice President, Student and Personnel Services, will perform the duties of the Dean as provided in this Article. The Faculty Member will be informed in writing at the beginning of the semester of evaluation as to the Dean, Associate Dean or Director who will be responsible for the Faculty Member's evaluation.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

OCT 1 1982